

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11, and 12 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, and 9 have been amended. Claims 2, 6, and 10 have been cancelled.

In the Office Action, claims 9-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite because the term “the printout display program” recited in the preamble of independent claim 9 lacks antecedent basis. Claim 9 has been amended to recite “a computer-readable recording medium bearing a printout display program,” thereby providing antecedent basis for “the printout display program.” The preamble of claim 9 has been further amended for clarity to recite that the program is for displaying printout in an apparatus for print preview, the apparatus having a display portion, a display data storage portion for storing display data representing content to be displayed on the display portion, and a print data storage portion for storing print data. These amendments are fully supported, for example, at page 19, line 4 et seq. of the present application. No new matter has been added. Applicant believes these amendments are fully responsive to the Examiner’s concerns.

Claims 1, 5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0010756 (Hobbs) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,381,163 (Yokoyama) and U.S. Patent No. 5,764,227 (Ishimine). Claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hobbs, Yokoyama and Ishimine as applied to claims above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,781,785 (Rowe). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the following arguments.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of independent claims 1, 5, and 9, these claims have been amended to include the limitations of original dependent claims 2, 6, and 10, respectively.

Consequently, claims 2, 6, and 10 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. These amendments should be entered because they do not raise any new issues requiring further search or consideration.

Original dependent claims 2, 6, and 10, whose limitations are now found in amended independent claims 1, 5, and 9, were rejected as being obvious over a combination of Hobbs, Yokoyama, Ishimine, and Rowe. In particular, the Office Action contends Rowe teaches the limitations of a display control portion (of amended claim 1) and data transfer step (of amended claims 5 and 9) that prevents transferring the part of print data representing the plurality of sheets of printout that is print data corresponding to an area located behind another sheet as a result of stacking the plurality of sheets. The Office Action admits that the combination of Hobbs, Yokoyama, and Ishimine does not teach this feature, but contends it would have been obvious to modify a Hobbs/Yokoyama/Ishimine combination to include this feature in view of Rowe.

Applicant disagrees. The claimed invention provides, on a display, a print preview of a plurality of sheets in parallel offset positions, based on stored data. See, for example, Fig. 1 of the present application. In the claimed invention, when print data is transferred from a print data storage portion to a display data storage portion, a display control portion prevents transferring the part of print data representing the plurality of sheets of printout corresponding to an area located behind another sheet as a result of stacking the plurality of sheets. As a result, when a print preview of the stacked display is performed, the amount of data transferred from the print data storage portion to the display data storage portion is reduced, thereby reducing a load on the apparatus.

The premise of the present invention is completely different than that of Rowe. Thus, the subject matter of Rowe is very different from that of the claimed invention. In the claimed

invention, a stacked display is presented; that is, a print preview for a plurality of sheets is simultaneously displayed on a display (see Fig. 1 of the present application). In contrast, in Rowe, only “one page” or “a part of one page” is simultaneously displayed on a display. In Rowe’s methodology, simultaneous transfer of multiple pages is prevented by manipulating the downloading of *a specific page of a document*. In Rowe, when downloading a file, plural sheets do not overlap each other in parallel offset positions sheet by sheet, as in the claimed invention. Therefore, Rowe’s methodology does not consider the overlapping of sheets, or preventing the transfer of data corresponding to an area located behind another sheet as a result of stacking the sheets, as does the claimed invention.

In summary, Rowe does not teach or even suggest the claimed display control portion (of amended claim 1) or data transfer step (of amended claims 5 and 9) that prevents transferring the part of print data representing the plurality of sheets of printout that is print data corresponding to an area located behind another sheet as a result of stacking the plurality of sheets. Therefore, any combination of Hobbs, Yokoyama, Ishimine, and Rowe would be missing these claimed features. Moreover, Rowe and the claimed invention prevent transfer of data in very different situations, and in different ways. The claimed invention prevents transferring part of print data corresponding to an area located behind another sheet as a result of stacking the plurality of sheets, while Rowe prevents transfer of data of pages that are not displayed at all. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to modify any combination of Hobbs, Yokoyama, Ishimine, and Rowe to yield the inventions of claims 1, 5, or 9.

Consequently, amended independent claims 1, 5, and 9 are patentable, as are claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, and 12, which depend from claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively.

Accordingly, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael A. Messina
Registration No. 33,424

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MAM:ilg
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: September 8, 2008

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**